



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 430  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,227	12/29/2000	Neal C. Oliver	P 273229 P10149	6607

7590 01/24/2007  
KEVIN A. REIF  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

JACKSON, JENISE E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/750,227	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OLIVER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jenise E. Jackson	<b>Art Unit</b> 2131	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 1899.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jennings et al(6,430,174) in view of Wilson(6,496,571).
3. As per claims 1, 11, Jennings discloses a method of providing authentication services to a first user regarding a second user(see col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 9, lines 30-39), requesting a certificate corresponding to the second user from an authentication server(see col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 12, lines 62-67, col. 13, lines 1-6); returning the certificate corresponding to the second user(col. 13, lines 30-44) requesting authentication of the certificate corresponding to the second user from a control program associated with the second user; returning an authentication certificate from the control program associated with the second user(see col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 12, lines 62-67, col. 13, lines 1-6, 30-44); and verifying authentication by comparing the authentication certificate corresponding to the second user and received from the control program associated with the second user with the certificate received from the authentication server(see col. 12, lines 63-67, col. 13, lines 1-6). Jennings does not disclose detecting a voice command from the first caller during the telephone call. Wilson discloses detecting a voice command from the caller during the telephone call(see col. 2, lines 8-10, 12-17, 22-25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include

Art Unit: 2131

detecting a voice command from the first caller during the telephone call of Wilson with Jennings, the motivation is that telephonic systems are known that to have a voice dialing pursuant to which automated voice recognition are employed to enable a telephone to respond to voice commands from the user, by detecting a voice command of a user by using voiceprint information, a caller can be correctly identified(see col. 7, lines 39-51 of Wilson).

4. As per claim 2, Jennings discloses wherein the first user communicates with the second user through a media gateway(see col. 4, lines 55-65).

5. As per claim 3, Jennings discloses monitoring the communication between the first user and the second user so that the authentication server may notify the first user if the second user changes or becomes untrustworthy(see col. 13, lines 61-67, col. 14, lines 1-9).

6. As per claim 4, Jennings discloses wherein the requesting of the certificate corresponding to the second user from the authentication server, requesting authentication of the certificate corresponding to the second user and the verifying authentication is performed by a control program associated with the first user(see col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 12, lines 62-67, col. 13, lines 1-6, 30-44).

7. As per claim 5, Jennings discloses wherein the first and second users are using client devices configured to communicate with each other and with the authentication server(see col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 9, lines 30-39).

8. As per claim 6, Jennings discloses wherein the client devices are smart phones(see col. 7, lines 28-38).

Art Unit: 2131

9. As per claim 7, Jennings discloses wherein the authentication server has authenticated an organization and the second user is a member of the authenticated organization (see col. 12, lines 62-67, col. 13, lines 1-6, 30-44).

10. As per claim 8, Jennings discloses wherein verifying authentication determines a level of trust between the first user, the authentication server and the second user(see col. 9, lines 30-39).

11. As per claim 9, Jennings discloses wherein the level of trust is a value corresponding to the probability that the authentication certificate corresponding to the second user and received from the control program associated with the second user is the same as the certificate received from the authentication server(see col. 9, lines 30-39, col. 12, lines 62-67, col. 13, lines 30-44).

12. As per claim 10, Jennings discloses wherein the authentication certificate corresponding to the second user and received from the control program associated with the second user includes a portion indicating the second user's identity (see col. 13, lines 1-6, 30-44).

13. As per claim 12, Jennings discloses wherein the authentication server is configured to monitor the communication between the first user and the second user(see col. 4, lines 55-65, col. 12, lines 62-67, col. 13, lines 1-6, 30-44).

14. As per claim 13, limitations already been addressed(see claim 3).

15. As per claim 14, Jennings discloses wherein the control program associated with the first user is configured to request the certificate corresponding to the second user from the authentication server, request authentication of the certificate corresponding to the second user and verify authentication (see col. 9, lines 30-39, col. 12, lines 62-67, col. 13, lines 30-44).

18. As per claim 15, limitations already been addressed(see claim 5).

19. As per claim 16, limitations already been addressed(see claim 6).

Art Unit: 2131

- 20. As per claims 17, limitations already been addressed(see claim 7).
- 21. As per claim 18, limitations already been addressed(claim 8).
- 22. As per claim 19, limitations already been addressed (see claim 9).
- 23. As per claim 20, limitations already been addressed (see claim 10).

authentication server(see col. 12, lines 63-67, col. 13, lines 1-6).

***Response to Applicant***

24. New Art has been applied to the claim limitation of “voice command”, see above for rationale. Thus, this is a new grounds of rejection. Thus remarks made by the Applicant are moot.


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jenise E Jackson whose telephone number is (571) 272-3791. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) alternate Friday's.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2131

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Janet', written in a cursive style.

January 19, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ayaz Sheikh', written in a cursive style.

AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100